



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Applicant:

Dennis M. O'Connor et al.

३०८

Art Unit: 2615

Serial No.: 09/150,577

ଶବ୍ଦରେଣୁ

Examiner: R. Chevalier

Filed: September 10, 1998

卷之三

For: Time Shifting By Simultaneously Recording and Playing a Data Stream

Atty Docket: ITL.0100P1US
P4575X

RECEIVED

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

JUN 17 2002

Technology Center 2600

REPLY TO PAPER NO. 4

Sir:

In response to the office action mailed March 13, 2002, reconsideration is requested in view of the following remarks and amendments.

IN THE CLAIMS

Please cancel claims 6-10, 18, and 19.

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been rejected over the combination of Sata and Gould. For the reasons set forth in the pending appeal, Sata is not believed to be in any way pertinent to the present application. However, Gould is even less pertinent than Sata. All that the Examiner apparently relies on Gould for is to teach a zoom function. But Gould does not teach providing a zoom function so that the second portion of the video stream may be scaled for implementing the zoom function while the first portion of the video stream is being written. Similarly, nothing in Sata in any way describes anything remotely having to do with providing a zoom feature.

Date of Deposit: 06-05-02
I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as **first class mail** with sufficient postage on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.
Cynthia L. Hayden
Cynthia L. Hayden